PTO/SB/21 (04-04)

Under the Pa	aperwork Reduction Act of	1995, no persor		nd Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERC ion of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number 09/445,523
TRANSMITTAL FORM (to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)				
			Filing Date	December 7, 1999
			First Named Inventor	Tsuyoshi Maeda
			Art Unit	2871
			Examiner Name	NGUYEN, Dung T
otal Number of Pages in This Submission		Attorney Docket Numb	er 9319S-000114	
		ENCLO	SURES (check all that ap	oly)
☐ Fee Transmittal Form		□ Drawin	g(s)	After Allowance Communication to Technology Center (TC)
Fee Attached		Licensing-related Papers		Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences
Amendment / Reply		Petition		Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)
After Final		Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application		Proprietary Information
Affidavits/declaration(s)		Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address		Status Letter
Extension of Time Request		Terminal Disclaimer		Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):
Express Abandonment Request		Request for Refund CD, Number of CD(s)		Issue Fee Transmittal; Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance; return post card
Information Disclosure Statement Certified Copy of Priority		Remarks		
Document(s)	-nonty	11.0		·
Response to Missi Incomplete Applic	•		•	
Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53				
	SIGNA	TURE OF	APPLICANT, ATTORNE	Y, OR AGENT
Firm or Individual name	Harness, Dickey &	Pierce, P.L.	Attorney Name C. Gregory Schivley	Reg. No. 27,382
Signature	J. Treggy / Churchy			
Date	August 16, 2004			
	C	ERTIFICA	TE OF TRANSMISSION	MAILING
	it postage as first	class mail ir	an envelope addressed	PTO or deposited with the United States Post to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 145
10.Adriuna, VA 22010	e G. Gregor	7 11 0 E 19 W.		

Signature Date August 16, 2004 This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or organia a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35.0.5.0.122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This objection is estimated to 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing/this burden, should be set to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22315-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1459, Alexandria, VA 2315-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

PHILIP & TOL



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application No.:

09/445.523

Filing Date:

December 7, 1999

Applicant:

Maeda

Group Art Unit:

2871

Examiner:

Dung Nguyen

Title:

LIQUID CRYSTAL DEVICE AND ELECTRONIC

APPARATUS

Attorney Docket:

9319S-000114

Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

Reasons for allowance are only warranted in instances in which "the record of the prosecution as a whole does not make clear [the Examiner's] reasons for allowing a claim or claims." 37 C.F.R. 1.104 (e). In the present case, Applicant believes the record as a whole makes clear the reasons for allowance and therefore no statement by the Examiner is necessary or warranted, especially since the statement may unfairly focus on certain reasons for allowance which are not reflected by the prosecution history. Therefore, the record should reflect that Applicant does not necessarily agree with each statement in the reasons for allowance. For example, while Applicant believes the claims are allowable, Applicant may not unequivocally agree that patentability resides solely in the specific feature or combination of features identified, or that each feature or combination of features identified is required for patentability, or that equivalents of any of the recited features are outside the scope of the claims. Moreover, to the extent the reasons for allowance do not separately address the subject

matter of all the claims, Applicant does not acquiesce to any inference that the non-addressed claims fail to present other reasons for patentability apart from the patentability of the claims which were specifically addressed by the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated:

Hug 16,2004

By:

G. Gregory Schivley

Bryant E. Wade

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C. P.O. Box 828 Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303 (248) 641-1600